



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and constitutional tendencies toward secession from the empire. As he did not have access to the English archives he contributes no new facts to our knowledge of illicit trade. A more concrete and exhaustive history of smuggling remains to be written from the abundant manuscript materials in the British Public Record Office.

FRANK W. PITMAN.

Yale University.

The Relations of Pennsylvania with the British Government 1696-1765. By. WINFRED TREXLER ROOT. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1912. Pp. iv, 422. \$1.50.)

This volume is the most substantial contribution that has been made thus far to the history of the colonies from the Anglo-American point of view. Its scope is so much wider than its title indicates that in many respects it may be looked upon as an adequate introduction to the larger relations of the colonies as a whole to the British government, for its author in preparing to present the place of Pennsylvania in the imperial scheme has rightly felt called upon to expound at some length the character of the British system of control and to outline with some elaborateness the principles according to which the British government acted. On this account the work should appeal to all who are interested in colonial history and its problems. Such problems inevitably present themselves in different forms and under different guises according to the individual peculiarities of each colony, but at bottom the issues at stake were much the same in all and the results formed part of a common movement making for independence. The value of Dr. Root's contribution lies not only in its thoroughness and impartiality, sure witnesses to the author's zeal for a complete marshaling of the facts and freedom from local bias and patriotic prejudice, but even more in the admirably balanced treatment, whereby that which is general is made specific by embodiment in the local affairs of the colony and that which is local is interpreted in the light of the British plan of empire.

The work deals with all aspects of the subject, welding into a symmetrical whole activities that were economic, legal, and religious, as well as those that were political and constitutional. One important chapter is devoted to the colony's attitude toward the difficult problem of defense. Naturally the commercial and

financial aspects of the relationship are given prominence, for they occupied a very important place in the general scheme of British policy, but no attempt is made to single them out for exceptional treatment or to assign to them space out of proportion to their actual importance. The chapters that are likely to attract the readers of this review are four: The Administration of the Acts of Trade, The Courts of Vice-Admiralty, The Royal Disallowance, and Finance and Politics. The chapter on the administration of the acts of trade, apart from its legal and functional aspects, treats of the efforts made by the royal officials to collect the royal revenue and to check smuggling and illicit commerce; that on the vice-admiralty courts deals more specifically with the legal machinery set up in the colonies to try breaches of the acts and to enforce the civil law within the field of admiralty jurisdiction; that on the royal disallowance concerns the control exercised by the home authorities over colonial legislation and their determination to prevent the passing of acts in any way impairing the free operation of the mercantile system; while that on finance and politics presents us with a series of vexatious and troublesome problems, in which monetary conditions are so interwoven with politics on one side and trade and commerce on the other that no writer can possibly deal with them as separate factors.

Each of these chapters presents, either in part or as a whole, aspects of colonial history that are commonly called economic and are, as a rule, handed over to the economic historian as his peculiar spoil. But one does not need to be labelled an economic historian to appreciate the significance of these subjects in the general history of the colonies. Colonial history cannot be written without a due understanding of them, for, as Dr. Root shows, the colonists disregarded all royal orders and acts of Parliament that ran counter to their economic interests and rendered futile all efforts of the Home government to order their affairs by artificial measures that did not conform to their economic advantages. He quotes, apparently with approval, the assertion of Mr. A. McFarland Davis that the "royal suppression of the Massachusetts land bank was of greater influence in creating opposition to parliamentary power in Massachusetts than the Stamp Act." If economic forces played so important a part in shaping the course of colonial history, such forces can in no wise be deemed the particular property of the economic specialist. The historian

who allows the economist to stake these claims as his own is selling his historical birthright for a mess of political and military pottage.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Yale University.

Why Women Are So. By MARY ROBERTS COOLIDGE. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1912. Pp. 371. \$1.50.)

In my opinion this book is the most concretely illuminating work that has been written on the "woman problem" since the publication of Mona Caird's *Morality of Marriage*. Any one who scrapes up even a superficial acquaintance with the current literature on this problem, one of the very few fundamental socio-economic problems as it is, knows how hastily the books are thrown together, what a reiterated sameness there is in them, and how clearly they betray the writers' fear that they will be too late to make their contribution to the woman movement's accelerated rapid progress unless they rush into print at once. Even the hardened reader of feminist literature will get little of this impression from Mrs. Coolidge's book, especially from the first two hundred pages, which deal with the "domestic traditions" and their effect upon women. It is true that Mrs. Coolidge has either advisedly or inadvertently allowed herself some repetition, but this is not a serious matter where the book is to be read by persons who have not hitherto had brought vividly to their consciousness what the actual psychological and economic effects of the domestic traditions of the nineteenth century were.

The question the author sets herself to answer is this: "Is the characteristic behavior which is called feminine an inalienable quality or merely an attitude of mind produced by the coercive social habits of past times?" "As a working hypothesis," she says, "it is assumed that the women of the nineteenth century in America were for the most part what men expected them to be; modified only by the disintegrating, and at the same time reconstructive, forces of modern society. In other words, sex traditions rather than innate sex character have produced what is called 'feminine' as distinguished from womanly behavior." That this "working hypothesis" is not an *a priori* conception for the substantiation of which the writer proceeds to distort the evidence of facts, but a conclusion forced upon her by experience and observation and in turn illuminating the facts, can scarcely be